

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-36 are pending and at issue in the application with claims 1, 7, 16, 22, 24, 26 and 32 being independent claims. Claims 7, 8, 22 and 24 have been allowed. Claims 1, 16, 26 and 32 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the remarks below is respectfully requested.

Each of claims 1-36 recites a system or method for sending probe messages to detect the presence of devices located on a bus that selects a plurality of device addresses to which a probe message will be sent from among address lists. An address list contains a set of device addresses, and another address list contains a set of addresses reserved for communication control devices.

**APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

On September 22, 2004, the Applicants' attorney Aaron M. Peters (Reg. No. 48,801) conducted a personal interview with Examiner Jeffrey A. Gaffin and Examiner Niketa I. Patel in which independent claims 1, 16, 26 and 32 were discussed. During that interview Examiners Gaffin and Patel indicated that claims 1, 16, 26 and 32, and all claims dependent thereon, would be allowable if amended in the manner provided above in an after final Office action amendment, and indicated that this case would be allowable upon entry of the amendments. Thus, agreement was reached with respect to all the claims.

The Examiners and the Applicants' attorney discussed during the interview that Perreault et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,793,307) does not disclose or suggest an address list containing addresses reserved for communication control devices as recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 32. While Perreault et al. discloses a primary station (10) which includes a database containing a list of active secondary stations (38), a database containing a list of unresponsive secondary stations (42), and a database containing a list of idle secondary stations (44) (Col. 6, ll. 30-57; Col. 8, ll. 48-62), the secondary stations are not communication control devices as recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 32. As such, the primary station does not maintain a list of addresses reserved for communication control devices.

In particular, the secondary stations (12, 14, 16) are not communication control devices as recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 32. The primary, or master, station of Perreault et al. controls the access of the secondary, or slave, stations on a transmission medium. (Col. 5, ln. 66 to col. 6, ln. 5). The secondary stations do not control communication on the transmission medium. Instead, the secondary stations may only transmit upon receipt of a poll from the primary station. (See e.g., col. 13, ln. 50 to col. 14, ln. 7). As such, Perreault et al. does not disclose or suggest a list of addresses reserved for communication control devices as recited by claims 1-36.

However, the Examiners requested during the interview that claims 1, 16, 26 and 32 be amended to further clarify the difference between a device and a communication control device, as recited in claims 1, 16, 26 and 32. As such claims 1, 16, 26 and 32 have been amended to clarify that a communication control device is configured to control communications on the bus.

Applicants gratefully appreciate the Examiners' assistance in helping to bring this application in condition for allowance. As such, amended independent claims 1, 16, 26 and 32 and independent claims 7, 22 and 24 are believed to be in allowable form, as indicated by the Examiners. Further, dependent claims 2-6, 8-15, 17-21, 23, 25, 27-31 and 33-36, which are dependent upon the aforementioned independent claims are also submitted to be in allowable form. Should the Examiners wish to discuss the foregoing, or any matter of form, the Examiners are urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP  
233 S. Wacker Drive  
6300 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357  
(312) 474-6200

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Aaron M. Peters  
Registration No.: 48,801  
Attorney for Applicants

February 15, 2005